

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

·	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
į	10/651,221	08/28/2003	Michael W. Wathen	Pharmacia Case 01669	7644
	26303	7590 02/26/2004	·	EXAMINER	
	FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 RAMBLING ROAD			SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G	
	KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1699			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1614	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>							
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	O#: A-4: C	10/651,221	MICHAEL W. WA	MICHAEL W. WATHEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	- 0			
		Phyllis G. Spivack	L	<u> </u>			
Period for	- The MAILING DATE of this commu r Reply	nication appears on the cover s	heet with the correspondence a	daress			
THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO - Failure - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN sions of time may be available under the provision BIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty ( period for reply is specified above, the maximum se to reply within the set or extended period for reply perly received by the Office later than three months department adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, howeve munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory minim statutory period will apply and will expire SI; y will, by statute, cause the application to b	er, may a reply be timely filed um of thirty (30) days will be considered time K (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this ecome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on		• •			
		2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the pract			e merits is			
Disposition	on of Claims						
4) 🖾	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the	application.					
4	a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	are withdrawn from considerat	ion.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•					
	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.			•			
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or election requirem	ent.				
Application	on Papers		•				
,	The specification is objected to by the						
,	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any obje	<del>-</del> · ·					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) includin						
/—	The oath or declaration is objected t	to by the Examiner. Note the a	ittached Office Action of form P	10-152.			
•	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
	Acknowledgment is made of a clain ☐ All b)	n for foreign priority under 35 t	J.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
, –	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority	documents have been receiv	ed.				
	<ol><li>Certified copies of the priority</li></ol>	y documents have been receiv	ed in Application No				
		s of the priority documents hav onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	e been received in this Nationa	l Stage			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office acti						
13) <b>[2</b> ] A	cknowledgment is made of a claim nce a specific reference was include CFR 1.78.	for domestic priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisiona				
,	☐ The translation of the foreign la	- ·					
	cknowledgment is made of a claim ference was included in the first ser						
Attachment	; (s)						
1) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892)	-	terview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No				
_	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) I		otice of Informal Patent Application (PT ther:	O-152)			

Art Unit: 1614

The undersigned Examiner supports the goal of the Office to advance prosecution as expediently as is reasonably possible. Cooperation is requested with respect to the timely submission of any references deemed pertinent to the present application along with Form PTO-1449.

Claims 1-21 are presented and represent all of the claims under consideration.

Claims 5-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The formulas designated as VII, VIII and IX, respectively, in claims 5, 9 and 14 lack clear antecedent basis in claim 1. The definitions of the terms may not be changed in dependent claims from their original definitions in claim 1 from which they depend.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed to the treatment or prevention of atherosclerosis or restenosis comprising administering a cinnoline or naphthyridine carboxamide compound of instant formulas VI, VII, VIII or IX. The specification provides a brief discussion of animal models to evaluate reduction of atherosclerosis or restenosis by administration of antiviral drug treatment. The models are directed to murine CMV infection and MHV, a murine gamma-herpes virus related to EBV. Applicants state compounds of the instant invention Inhibit replication of viruses and

Art Unit: 1614

show an effect on the development of atherosclerosis. Two authors are cited to provide support; however, the references are not provided.

Attention is directed to <u>In re Wands</u>, 8 USPQ2d 1400 where the court set forth factors to consider when assessing whether or not a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors are:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples
- 4) the nature of the invention
- 5) the state of the art
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

The instant specification fails to provide guidance that would allow the skilled artisan background sufficient to practice the instant invention without resorting to undue experimentation in view of further discussion below.

The nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art

The claimed invention relates to the treatment or prevention of atherosclerosis or restenosis comprising administering a cinnolinecarboxamide or naphthyridine carboxamide of instant formulas VI, VII, VIII or IX.

Art Unit: 1614

The relative skill of those in the art is generally that of a Ph.D. or M.D. in the fields of virology or cardiology.

Each particular atherosclerotic or restenotic event has its own specific characteristics and etiology. The broad recitation "treatment or prevention of atherosclerosis or restenosis" is inclusive of many conditions that presently have no established successful therapies.

It is clear the art to which the present invention relates is highly unpredictable and unreliable with respect to conclusions drawn from laboratory data extrapolated to clinical efficacy.

## The breadth of the claims

In view of the plethora of compounds herein claimed, as well as the recitation "preventing" in addition to treating, the claims are broad.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

There are no working examples.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Applicants have failed to provide guidance as to which particular compound of instant formulas VI, VII, VIII or IX would be preferred for treatment or prevention of either atherosclerosis or restenosis. The skilled artisan would expect the interaction of a particular drug in the treatment or prevention of either condition to be very specific and highly unpredictable absent a clear understanding of the structural and biochemical basis for each agent. The instant specification sets forth no such understanding nor any

Art Unit: 1614

criteria for extrapolating beyond a hypothesis alleged by a previous publication. Beyond the suggestion that inhibition of the replication of a virus may have an effect on atherosclerosis, no direction is provided to treat restenosis. Absent reasonable a priori expectations of success for using a particular chemotherapeutic agent to treat or prevent atherosclerosis or restenosis, one skilled in the arts would have to test extensively many compounds to discover which particular one shows efficacy for either condition. Since each prospective embodiment, as well as future embodiments as the art progresses, would have to be empirically tested, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope. The specification provides inadequate guidance to do otherwise.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are directed to treatment and prevention of atherosclerosis and restenosis comprising administering compounds of instant formulas VI, VII, VIII and IX. The specification fails to describe or define the plethora of heterocyclic compounds within the definitions of the terms.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack at telephone number 703-308-4703.

Art Unit: 1614

February 21, 2004

Page 6

Phyllis G. Spivack
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1614

PHYLLIS SPIVACK PRIMARY EXAMINE